

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 748

SP 005 967

TITLE The Hyde Park Cadre As A Social System.
INSTITUTION Chicago Univ., Ill. Ford Training and Placement Program.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 60p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Demonstration Programs; Educational Innovation; *Interaction Process Analysis; Models; Program Descriptions; *Social Systems; *Teacher Education; *Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Hyde Park Cadre

ABSTRACT

This report is a description and analysis of the Hyde Park cadre as a "social system:" a description of the Hyde Park High School, the early life of the cadre, its operations and the disbanding of the cadre in June 1970. For the most part, it deals with the cadre and its activities for the 7 1/2 month period of its existence. Data were collected from secondary sources, interviews, nonparticipant observation at meetings, reading of correspondence, and observation of daily cadre activities. The Hyde Park cadre constituted a failure of the model; however, it offered many learning experiences for self-correlation of the program. These learnings are suggested in the implications. Appendixes of related program materials include a raw chronology of the cadre, its activities, and the major events in the external system which had implications for it. (Related document is SP005 964.) (MJM)

ED 070748

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EOU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE HYDE PARK CADRE

AS A

SOCIAL SYSTEM

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Research and Evaluation

July, 1970

TABLE of CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Methodology | 1 |
| The Setting | 2 |
| Early Life of the Cadre | 4 |
| What did the term "Cadre" mean to the members? | 8 |
| How did it Operate? | 11 |
| Internal System vs. External System | 17 |
| The disbanding of the Hyde Park Cadre | 20 |
| Implications | 21 |
| Appendices | 23 |
| A. Major Events in the Life of the Hyde Park Cadre and Hyde Park High School | |
| B. Agenda for Hyde Park Cadre Retreat | |
| C. Hyde Park Cadre Goals | |
| D. Hyde Park Cadre Suggested Projects | |
| E. Hyde Park Cadre Concerns | |
| F. Request for W.E.S.P. Researcher | |
| G. Social Work Services at Hyde Park High School | |
| H. Staff Response to Cadre Decisions of January 26, 1970 | |
| I. Synopsis of a Cadre Meeting | |
| J. Proposal for Hyde Park High School <u>A Reading Moratorium</u> | |
| K. Questionnaire Sent to Cadre | |
| L. Invitation to Cadre Disbanding Session | |
| M. List of General Statements Prepared by Cadre Explaining Reasons for Disbanding | |
| N. Rejection of Hyde Park Request for Funds | |

INTRODUCTION

The first phase of research and evaluation for the Ford Training and Placement Program is that of gathering data on the processes involved in the development of a cadre. This report is a description and analysis of the Hyde Park cadre as a "social system."

The Hyde Park cadre is no longer in existence. It formally announced its disbandment on Monday, June 15, 1970. We can look upon the experiences of this cadre in retrospect, not such as a failure, but as a learning experience for an experimental program involved in teacher training. It is in this light that the report is written.

The report includes a description of Hyde Park High School, the early life of the cadre, its operations, and the disbanding of the cadre. For the most part it deals with the cadre and its activities for the seven and a half months the reporter was with the cadre in the formal capacity as a researcher.

In the Appendices the reader will find a raw chronology of the cadre, its activities, and the major events in the external system which had implications for it. It might be helpful to read this section at the outset to gain a sense of where the cadre went. It might also be of use to refer to it while reading the report.

METHODOLOGY

The author did not join the cadre until November, 1969, and unfortunately cannot describe the group as an emerging social system. Secondary data sources have been used to document developments up to this point. Previously the author had been in contact with the cadre as an FPHP staff member and also conducted

interviews with the professional members of the cadre and the students for research and evaluation. He had also attended one cadre meeting as a guest and a cadre weekend retreat (October 31, 1969-November 2, 1969) as an FTPP staff representative.

During the period from mid-November, 1969, to June 22, 1970, the researcher attended all cadre meetings but one as a non-participant observer. Notes were taken at each meeting. Assistance was given to the cadre in the form of feedback when requested, either through verbatim transcripts and/or synopses of the issues. Upon request information was given regarding previous developments and decisions.

Another form of data collection was through the reading of correspondence concerning the Hyde Park cadre in the FTPP files.

A third form of data collection took place in the school itself. On occasion the reporter went to the school for faculty meetings, lunch periods, professional preparation periods, and the like to observe the interaction among cadre members, and also cadre members and non-cadre faculty and students in order to ascertain a sense of the informal school environment. The reporter also attended a number of Woodlawn Community Board meetings where Hyde Park faculty and Hyde Park cadre concerns were discussed.

THE SETTING

Description of Hyde Park High School

Hyde Park High School is an inner-city school in Chicago. It is located in the Woodlawn section of the city just south of the University of Chicago. The student enrollment is 100 per cent Black. The faculty racial composition is two-thirds Black. The enrollment is around 1,500 students and 100 faculty members.

Two years ago the Woodlawn Experimental School District was created encompassing Kindergarten through twelfth grade from Wadsworth Elementary School and Upper-Grade Center plus Hyde Park High School. This program is a cooperative venture among

the community of Woodlawn, the Chicago Board of Education, and the University of Chicago. The Woodlawn Community Board, which is the governing body for the experimental district, is composed of representatives of all three institutions. The Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project (WESP) is responsible for implementing the directives of the Woodlawn Community Board. There is a staff in each of the schools responsible for implementing the program.

Both the teacher and student transiency rates are high. The student body had declined from 3,000 in 1965 to approximately 1,400 in September, 1969. There were two reasons for this. The first was the fact that the gangs in the area intimidated students to either join them or leave the school. The second was the fact that another high school, Kenwood, was built in the same school district, and many students transferred there. In June, 1969, 40 per cent of the faculty left the school. Many problems have developed which can be traced to this rapid turnover and transiency.

The administrator of the school was hired by the Woodlawn Community Board and entered the school with the project in September, 1968. Within this two-year period there has been considerable discord involving the administration and other components in the school.

Hyde Park High School has been undergoing reconstruction. In September, 1969, construction and teaching were going on at the same time. Teachers and students were assigned to rooms in a section of the building which was being renovated and, therefore, blocked off. There was much confusion over the rescheduling of these classes. Some WESP projects could not be implemented because of the reconstruction.

It was into this situation that the Hyde Park cadre entered the school in September, 1969: a school which already had an experimental program and was trying to implement projects related to the experiment; a school where there was

much conflict between the administration and the other components of the school; a school undergoing reconstruction. The question therefore arises as to whether this was a trainable situation in the first place.

EARLY LIFE OF THE CADRE

The Hyde Park cadre was originally called the "third cadre." As of July 1, 1969, no placement school had been identified for the eight interns who comprised it. In fact, it was not until the second week in July that the cooperating school was identified. Previously the group had gone to four schools to be interviewed for possible placement. One school, Wells High School, which was an integrated situation, was identified as the place for this group. At the last moment, this placement fell through. Since Hyde Park High School was not selected until mid-July, there was no chance to formally select the experienced teachers who would work with the interns.

The recruitment of the interns was done in the spring of 1969. One of them was interested in entering the MAT program and joined the FTPP for financial reasons. Another would not promise to stay for the placement year. This intern was informed that the program needed another person in his discipline and he was not required to commit himself for two years.

There were eight interns at the start, as previously stated. Seven were white and one was Black. Two were in social studies, three in mathematics, two in English, and one was a social work intern. There were three males and five females. Three of them had had previous experience in teaching. All but one of the interns were second-year MAT's (i.e., ones who had already finished their course work at the University and who were ready to do their internship to fulfill their degree requirements). Of this group, four had done their student teaching at Hyde Park High School.

As the summer progressed a liaison was added to the cadre. She was an experienced teacher who had been a cadre member at another school in 1963-69, and was entering a graduate program at the University. There was an attempt to get experienced teachers from Hyde Park High School to work with the cadre interns during the summer. This was carried out by the interns themselves, since the administrator was out of the country for the summer, and many of the teachers were not in the city. One of the experienced teachers who had attended one cadre meeting in the summer became a member of the cadre in the fall. Another one of the members, who had refused membership in the summer, was later persuaded by a friend to become a member in the fall.

During the summer the discussions of the interns focused around issues which they could not really resolve, since they were not a complete cadre. They spent much time talking about the school, their acceptance by the rest of the faculty, the student body, and the like. A group process consultant met with the group twice and tried to get them to talk about themselves and what they were about. These efforts were resisted.

A researcher attended the cadre meetings as a non-participant observer during the summer. He identified himself as a graduate student who was trying to study the socialization process of new teachers and who did not have any responsibilities to the FTTP. At the end of the summer he wrote a report on the cadre and its progress and submitted the report to the cadre prior to submitting it to the program. Since the cadre did not respond to it as a group, he then submitted it to the Executive Director of the program. At the beginning of the year the cadre submitted a letter to the Director of Research and Evaluation stating that the researcher had misrepresented himself to them and, therefore, the report was considered a breach of promise. The cadre asked that the report not be published. The Director of Research granted the request.

In August the Executive Director of the program and the cadre liaison had met with representatives of the Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project to discuss the entry of the cadre into the school. After that meeting the Executive Director of the program wrote to the principal requesting that a community person be added to the cadre. This, however, was not done until November.

In September the interns, minus one of the math people, entered the school. At this time they submitted a list of experienced teachers at Hyde Park High School whom they wanted to work with them. The administrator stated that this list of people was unacceptable, since many of those on it were not really experienced. During the third week of school the administrator asked the department chairmen with interns in their departments to join the cadre as "Master Teachers". She also asked them to submit the name of another person in their department to work with the group. Two accepted and chose one other member from their department. When the list came out the interns had the Executive Director negotiate for one of the experienced teachers they had originally selected. The administrator agreed. The first meeting of the expanded cadre was September 20, 1969.

The experienced teacher component consisted of two males and five females, one of whom was white. Three of them had taught for one year. The others had taught at Hyde Park for five, six and eight years. One of these people had previous experience as a teacher in Kentucky prior to coming to Chicago. Three of them had attended Chicago Public Schools as students. Two came from segregated schools in the South, one from a private school, and one had attended parochial schools. One of them taught in a predominantly white school in Chicago for a semester, while the rest had done all of their professional teaching in Chicago in "inner-city" schools.

As previously stated, they were in the same disciplines as the interns with the exception of the Guidance counselor. Since there was no social worker

assigned to the school by the Board of Education, and since the social work intern was based in the guidance office, this was the logical person to join the cadre.

The administrator was Black. She had been the principal of a Chicago Elementary school for nineteen years previous to her appointment to Hyde Park. She was-hired by the Woodlawn Community Board to enter the school with WESP.

A new group process consultant entered the group at the first official meeting of the cadre on September 22, 1969. He was Black, an experienced teacher in the Chicago Public Schools, and a human relations coordinator for the Board of Education.

At the beginning of October the administrator supported the suggestion that students become members of the cadre. One of the main reasons the student issue was pushed was because the school, which is an experimental school under the direction of the Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project, worked under the CAPTS model (Community, Administration, Parents, Teachers, and Students). Since all elements of the model are to be present in all committees and groups in the school, it was only natural that they be included in the cadre.

One of the experienced teachers was in charge of the selection of the student members of the group. She contacted the student Government groups and asked them to submit names to her who they felt should become members of the cadre. They were asked to submit the name of one person per class. There were three girls chosen, one from the Freshman, Sophomore, and Junior classes. Upon the request of the cadre, three males were also chosen representative of all classes. No Seniors were represented in the cadre. The process was completed in early November, when an orientation was held for them.

The cadre members found themselves caught between two forces, the administration of the school and the Hyde Park based WESP program staff. The cadre's

way of solving this problem was to invite a WESP researcher to join the group. A letter was dispatched to the head of the Program staff requesting a researcher. In November, 1969 a WESP representative was sent, since they did not have a researcher to spare.

In November, at a meeting attended by interns, experienced teachers, the administrator, and the liaison the question of WESP was raised. At that time the cadre members thought that it would be to their benefit to have an FTTP researcher attend their meetings to document what they were doing as added protection. It was at this time that this reporter joined the cadre upon their request.

By the end of November the cadre included seven interns, seven experienced teachers, the administrator of the school, six students, an FTTP liaison, a group process consultant, a WESP representative, a parent, and an FTTP researcher.

In January two interns left the group. In March one of the experienced teachers withdrew from the cadre. In June the cadre disbanded.

WHAT DID THE TERM CADRE MEAN TO THE MEMBERS?

The term "cadre" took on various connotations during the development of the group. The first definition was a group whose purpose was to implement school related projects. This was the first focus of the group in September. The students were given this definition during the orientation session held for them in November. During the interviews this was what the students felt the cadre was "about".

Publicly the cadre was another example of the CAPTS model institutionalized. This was the rationale for having students and a parent and community person in it. At the conference held in the Spring of 1970 this conceptualization of the cadre was explained to the conferees by the group.

Another definition of "cadre" was a group "for the benefit of the interns". The experienced teachers were originally given to believe they would be "Master Teachers" to the interns. Another confirmation of this notion of cadre was the actions of the interns in certain instances. A special meeting to discuss rumors going around the school to the effect that the interns would not be allowed to return for the Placement Year, and to decide upon a strategy to deal with the rumors, was called for just interns. When asked about this, the rationale given was that they were the ones on the cutting edge, and, therefore, they had to make the decision.

"Cadre" also meant a source of financial resources. For the administrator, the experienced teachers, the students, and the WESP representative it was means of getting funds and resources for the school which had not been previously available. For the interns it meant a chance to acquire support for tuition, income and job security. Several interns stated they would remain in the cadre to insure their tuition payments and the \$600 stipend which FIPP offered them as long as the cadre was in existence. In fact when the decision to disband was discussed, one of the objections was the fact that financial support for the interns and the possibility of receiving the \$10,000 placement Year allotment would be no more.

"Cadre" meant meetings to many people both experienced teachers and interns. One of the questions in the interviews had been, "What changes would you like to see made?". When the cadre was mentioned, the term was used to denote meetings. This was pointed out again when the cadre was discussing the lack of classroom visitations, which had been decided upon as a cadre project. To justify non-participation one experienced teacher stated, "When I leave the cadre and get back to school on Tuesdays, I forget what we decided to do on Monday."

In January the term "Membership" was used to denote "classroom teachers", and the term "outsider" meant non-classroom teachers. Upon close examination this was not entirely the case. At that time there was a meeting held of cadre "members" to decide what the role of the "outsiders" was to be. Besides classroom teachers, however, the guidance counselor and the administrator were invited to attend this meeting. Excluded were the liaison, consultant, and the non-classroom teachers who had been invited by the cadre to join.

The consultant had another definition for "cadre". During the discussion as to whether the cadre should switch from school related projects, such as improved study halls, to teacher competence, he stated, "If you don't discuss teacher competence, you will be stealing money from Ford, since that's the purpose of the cadre."

Along with the consultant, the liaison stated several times that the cadre was to share the experiences of each of the members and to use their resources. The cadre was a means of "sharing" experiences and seeking help.

Finally, "cadre" meant a group consisting of interns and experienced teachers. This definition of cadre was enunciated at the last meeting of the cadre in June, 1970. The week prior to this meeting the cadre held an open meeting attended by FTTP staff, and WESP representatives. At that time two FTTP staff members and the Executive Director of WESP asked them to reconsider their decision to disband, which was announced at that time. They were also reminded that, if they did disband, they would have to go before the Woodlawn Community Board to explain their reasons for disbanding and that they would possibly have to go before the Personnel Committee of WCB, since they were planning to enter the school as individuals. In their reconsideration, only four interns and one student were interested in continuing as a cadre. One intern at that time stated, "Since I still have to take courses at the

University, I'll be the intern and the rest of you will be the experienced teachers, so we will still have a cadre." Thus, after a year's experience, cadre merely meant interns and experienced teachers.

HOW DID IT OPERATE?

Cadre members worked as individuals

Support came from individuals in the cadre, not from the group. Cadre members did not discuss individual teaching problems as a group. Interns sought help from other interns or experienced teachers individually. Neither group brought professional problems to the cadre.

Most of the sharing took place in one to one relationships. There were various curriculum projects which individuals did in their own classes, but they were not sharing with the cadre. Professional trips were made during the year but were never discussed in meetings.

Individual cadre members resisted attempts to link them to a special group in the school. When issues were raised about collective action that was taken and the implications thereof, it was stated that they should be judged as individuals. A case in point was when the liaison met with the wife interns to discuss their leaving a Woodlawn Community Board meeting together while the meeting was still in progress.

Leadership in the cadre

At the beginning of the year the liaison noted that the cadre members were looking to her for leadership. It was she who called meetings, set the agenda, moderated, and the like. She was not sure if this was viewed by the group as ascribed power or legitimate power. She, therefore, had the cadre

decide how they wanted the convenorship to operate. The system adopted was that of rotating convenorship beginning with the top of the alphabet on down. Each person had this responsibility for two meetings.

There was little consistency in the leadership. Three reasons were given for this. First, for the most part the convenorship determined the leadership for a particular meeting. On the other hand, some of the members felt the lack of consistent leadership was due to the consensus model. Others attributed it to the fact that individual commitment would vary from time to time, thus effecting involvement. Consistent leadership was forthcoming from the administrator, guidance counselor, and consultant when the group got bogged down in discussion of implementation. Near the end of the year, however, one of the female interns took on this role.

Consensus model for decision making

The cadre adopted the consensus model for decision making. This was done reluctantly by some. Some objected to it on the basis that it was too time consuming. Later in the year objections were raised that the lack of a definite leader for the group led to mass confusion. However, there was resistance to appointing one person as chairman for cadre meetings.

The consensus model presupposed a circularity of power, or shared power. This was unrealistic, since there was definite linearity in operation. When the administrator was present at meetings, she exerted a great deal of control over the members. When she was not present, inaction resulted for fear approval would not be forthcoming. At times the administrator used her position to encourage people to follow a certain course. An example of this linearity was the rejection of the original list of experienced teachers and her eventual selection of that segment of the cadre.

The linearity in the teacher-student relationship was quite clear. Students were expected to call the teachers by their last names. The students were reminded of this linearity when they stepped out of the traditional mode.

There was also linearity in the implementation of the model in the role of the cadre liaison. The liaison was the person who had final approval of expenditures taken from the \$2,000 cadre fund. It was upon her recommendation that such requisitions would be accepted by the Executive Director.

Another hindrance to the functionality of the consensus model was the fact that there was a lack of honesty in the cadre. Frequently there were attempts to arrive at consensus by polling the group. People often failed to openly state their opinion of the position being considered. Thus, true consensus would not be reached.

Avoidance of Conflict

Confrontation was not the norm of the group. In instances where confrontation with a member of the internal or external system appeared to be a viable alternative solution, the choice was frequently made to ignore it. Direct hostile remarks and actions made during meetings were deemed "inappropriate, irrational, and non-professional" and, therefore, to be ignored. For example the male, female, and racial conflicts, which were in operation in the group, were not discussed.

One of the main avoidance techniques employed by the cadre members was that of going to the Executive Director. This was used when there was conflict with WESP, the liaison, the Administrator, and the consultant. The cadre members' expectations were for the Executive Director to handle such situations for them.

A large part of this tendency to "avoid" issues and not to confront others could be explained by the socialization process which was carried out in the cadre. The experienced teachers felt that confronting the forces in the school was to no avail and, therefore, did not do so. The interns adopted this policy. On the other hand, the interns felt that confronting the FTPP was to no avail. The experienced teachers adopted this policy. Thus, a submissive quality prevailed.

Attendance at meetings

Attendance at meetings was quite steady until January. Of the forty meetings attended by the researcher, the six experienced teachers who remained in the cadre until June missed an average of 14.3 meetings. The range of absences was from 3 to 18. Of the five interns who remained in the cadre, the average absence was 6.4. The range was from 4 to 12 absences. The students missed an average of 22.6 meetings with a range from 21 to 26. The liaison and consultant each missed 10 meetings. The WESP representative, administrator, and parent missed 16, 26, and 27 meetings respectively.

There were certain conditions which contributed to the absences. Students, the WESP representative, and the parent were not expected to attend the "all-cadre meetings." The students often encountered difficulty in getting rides to the University for the meetings. Even though there was an established meeting place, only fourteen out of forty meetings were held there. On occasion some members, specifically the non-teachers and administrator, were not informed of the change in meeting place. The absence of the administrator was apparently accepted by the cadre members. By March they had resigned themselves to asking her to attend special meetings.

Another contributing factor to the lack of attendance was the inconsistency in the imposition of sanction for non-attendance by FPHP. In addition there was concern over the payment of non-cadre experienced teachers who were never docked.

The consultant often missed meetings due to other commitments. The cadre was given the option to reschedule such meetings, but they decided not to do so. The liaison missed some meetings due to illness, and some due to being out of town. Another contributing factor was the perception that her presence was not really valued by the cadre.

How did the discussions go?

The cadre's discussions were unfocussed. For example, during the discussion of "Racial and Cultural Biases of Teachers" (see Appendix I) fifty-one issues were raised. Tangents were chased, and each time there was an attempt to bring the discussion back to the original topic, another issue would be raised.

Most of the discussions were in either of two veins. The first was that of discussions of concrete issues in the abstract. A good example of this could be seen in the discussions about the role of the social work intern. The comments about the program were for the most part about the negative connotations of the social worker in the society and not about this particular social worker in this particular school.

The second vein was through discussions of minute details of implementation. This would be found in the discussion about classroom visitations. These discussions became clouded by placing several variables on the floor for consideration at one time. The decision as to whether the visitations would be scheduled took thirteen single-spaced pages of a transcript. The cadre may have been attempting to circumvent issues because of the lack of trust. As

previously stated there was a reluctance to talk about oneself and one's classroom in the meetings.

Through an analysis of a random sample of meetings from December until May it was discovered that interns as a group spoke more than experienced teachers with the exception of the discussion of the racial issue. At meetings attended by the Executive Director more statements were made by experienced teachers than interns, but once she would leave, the interns would resume the leadership. The administrator was usually involved in much discourse. The students and parent addressed the group the least. The students subgrouped, throughout meetings, however, making side comments to each other, which was facilitated by five out of six of them always sitting together.

Most agenda items were Ford initiated, either programmatically, such as a Placement Year Proposal, or through the liaison or consultant, such as classroom visitations and the issue of trust. Major problems of the school were absent from the discussions.

In-puts by the students frequently were ignored. For this reason student in-put became limited for the most part to responses to the question, "What do the students think?" This relationship was, therefore, a one-way transaction. The students would be asked for formulae on how "teachers" should act, while their concerns would not be addressed. Subsequently the students either sat quietly, talked to each other, or fell asleep, which went uninterrupted, and frequently unmentioned.

INTERNAL SYSTEM vs. EXTERNAL SYSTEM*

A cadre has many forces working on it from the inside and from the outside. In particular the Hyde Park Cadre had to be concerned with the following systems as parts of the "external system":

Administration--Board of Education

Ford Training and Placement Program

Hyde Park High School

Peers

University of Chicago

Woodlawn Community Board

Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project

Representatives of all of the "institutions" which comprised the external system were present in the internal system. When people entered the cadre, they originally represented roles. These roles were defined by one or more segments of the external system. It was the job of the cadre to formulate a synthesis of these roles and to identify the resources each role and its incumbent brought to the situation. One of the reasons the Hyde Park Cadre did not evolve into an effective cadre was the failure to identify and utilize the resources available to them. A prime example of this was the defining of non-classroom teachers with exception of the guidance counselor and the administrator as "outsiders".

Not all elements of the internal system had to deal with all elements of the external system. For the most part the schoolbased people did not have to deal directly with the University of Chicago, while the interns had to do

* The "internal system" denotes the members of the cadre, and the external system denotes the institutions and groups which have a relation to and an effect upon it (i.e. the environment)

this. The Hyde Park High School students did not have the pressure of dealing with non-cadre faculty members as colleagues but they did have to deal with other students.

At times it was difficult to sift out the pressures of the internal and external systems as to which was operating in a particular situation. This is to say that all of these institutions had various expectations for and of the cadre. At times these expectations conflicted in terms of methods of implementation and sequencing. It was incumbent upon the cadre members, themselves, to resolve these conflicts, both internally and externally, if they were to survive as a group. Since there was no resolution in the case of the Hyde Park Cadre, the conflict from the outside continued and became manifest on the inside, and the members remained a collection of individuals.

Let us examine some of these expectations and see how they were processed by the cadre. The school based people were looking for new resources for the school, both material and financial. The experienced teachers wanted to help stabilize the faculty, gain new perspectives on education, and to help the new teachers. The Hyde Park High School students wanted to develop projects for the school. The administrator stated several times that she wanted the cadre to implement programs she had been thinking about for many years. WESP wanted help in implementing projects under its auspices. The Board of Education wanted to see an improvement in reading scores, student attendance, faculty staying power, and teaching competence.

FTPP was interested in testing a model for the training and placing of teachers. They had expectations of a supportive group which would improve the competence of the interns and increase their staying power in the school. They also had expectations of the cadre coming up with projects which would

be of service to the school. The interns wanted help in curriculum matters, financial support, for their degrees, assistance in school and Board procedures, and changes in the type of education in "inner-city" schools. The University of Chicago wanted research done on the training of teachers for "inner-city" schools.

The two main areas of consistency were "improved in-role competence" and "school related projects". The conflict came in sequencing and methods of implementation. The cadre originally began with school related projects. FTTP, through the liaison, the consultant, and the Executive Director, wanted them to deal with the subject of teacher competency first which could be implemented through projects, such as classroom observations, which could be shared with the cadre as a whole.

The consideration of classroom observations was an example of poor timing and implementing. The cadre had expanded from eight to twenty-six within a span of two months. Cadre composition was 75% white in September, 1969 and 73% Black in November, 1969. By the end of the summer of 1969 the interns had become a cohesive group. The experienced teachers were not the ones the interns had requested (with one exception). There were students in the cadre who were in classes taught by cadre members. The administrator, who was responsible for teacher ratings, was also a member of the cadre. Trust had not built up. The interns and experienced teachers had already shown that they would talk to individuals about their problems, but not to the group. Thus, such a threatening issue as classroom observations was not within the scope of the group at that time. This is not to say that the subject of "Teacher Competency" should not have been discussed by the group. School related projects were a convenient escape for the group. Trust could be built up through discussions of teacher competence, which would enable the group to

arrive at the point where they could discuss classroom observations. But December was not the time, because the other pre-requisite processes had not occurred.

There was a consensus among the interns as to what was external and what was internal. In January one intern told the Executive Director that FPHP was external to the cadre. Another had stated in the interviews, "Now that we are at Hyde Park, Ford is removed." Through her repeated absence the administrator became external. There was, however, no support for each other in approaching external demands. The cadre did not attain the strength to respond to demands made by the external system with the phrase, "That is irrelevant to us, and we will not consider it", as did the other two 1969-70 cadres at various points during the year.

Part of the problem was a lack of shared sense of purpose and trust. Each time an element of the external system made a demand, either through an internal or external agent, the cadre would spend time second guessing the "real" reason for the request, trying to get another element of the system to deal with it for them, pretending it did not exist, or submitting to it.

Thus, the external system was viewed as a hindrance and not as supportive to the internal system. The internal system did not evolve the strength to deal with this, nor did it evolve support for its members. The synthesis of the two never came about, so that people could fluctuate between the two and rarely be challenged.

THE DISBANDING of the HYDE PARK CADRE

Several reasons were given for the disbanding of the cadre by the members themselves; namely, the introduction of the cadre to the school, the selection

procedure, the conflict among various elements of the external system, the racial make-up of the cadre, a lack of communication between the internal and external systems, and a lack of clarity as to the staff roles. The members felt that they had no control over any of the above. They felt the cadre was just a microcosm of Hyde Park High School. As for the non-development of leadership, the consensus model was to blame.

In actuality the disbanding of the Hyde Park Cadre began long before the official decision to do so was reached. The history of the cadre was one of unresolved conflict, both internally and externally. Cross-role training never evolved. Internal support was not forthcoming. Resources were ignored. Suspicion was high. Commitment to the cadre notion was not held by all. Support was not forthcoming from the external system. Beginning in January members withdrew, either formally or informally. The administrator never became an integral part of the group. There was a failure to deal with self. Thus, if "cadre" implies a supportive group, the term Hyde Park Cadre is a misnomer.

IMPLICATIONS

The Hyde Park Cadre constituted a failure of the model; at the same time, however, it offered many learnings for self-correction of the program. It is hopeful that this type of report has provided the feedback for such self-correction. The following discussion is by no means exhaustive, but constitutes the major points the author feels should be addressed.

One of the main learnings from this experience is that the mere juxtaposition of roles does not constitute a cadre. The role incumbents must be considered. The selection procedure must take into account the sex, age, race, and personality

of each participant. Rites of passage varied as much with role incumbents as they did with the roles themselves. This was pointed out in the socialization process undergone in the induction of cadre members into the school and into the cadre itself.

As previously pointed out, sequencing was vital to the life of the cadre. The lack of complete cadre participation in Summer Program where the role incumbents could begin to build a cohesive group, stifled the cadre. The pressures from the school on the neophyte teachers in September required so much energy, there was little left for the cadre. This process must be initiated in an atmosphere as relatively free from external pressures as possible.

Third, the area of communications must be improved. Staff expectations of cadres should be explicitly stated at the outset, and enforcement thereof must be consistent. By the same token, cadres should have a clear understanding of the resources available and needed, especially as regards non-traditional roles, such as community and students, prior to their incorporation into the cadre. Where this is not the case, a process of negotiation and renegotiation becomes a process of constant ambivalence on the part of all involved.

Finally, placing two experimental programs with many of the same goals in the same school but under different auspices created needless problems for both.

25 -
Appendix A

MAJOR EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF HYDE PARK CADRE
AND HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL
May, 1969 - June, 1970

May, 1969

Interns were selected.

Interns visited Harlan and Phillips High Schools for interviews about placement.
Interns visited Tulley and Wells High Schools for interviews about placement and
stated a preference for Wells.

June, 1969

Negotiations begun by FPHP staff at Wells High Schools.

Spring quarter ended.

Wells High School fell through.

A Black intern was added to the group.

Summer program began without a placement school for the cadre.

July, 1969

Liaison was added to the group.

The cadre was told by the incoming Executive Director that Hyde Park, Gage
Park, or Kennedy High School could be their placement school.

Interns chose Hyde Park High School.

Researcher entered the group.

Summer program group process consultant entered the group for two meetings.

Interns attempted to recruit experienced teachers from Hyde Park High School
for the cadre with little success.

Assistant principal of Hyde Park High School met with the cadre.

August 1969

Summer program ended.

Luncheon was held with the Executive Director, the Liaison, and WESP representatives to discuss the entry of the cadre to the school.

A letter was sent to the Administrator of Hyde Park High School requesting a community representative and naming five experienced teachers and the interns who wanted to work with them.

The researcher who met with them during the summer sent them a copy of his report to FPHP and asked for feedback.

September, 1969

The cadre interns entered the school.

At the first faculty meeting the day school opened. The administrator introduced the cadre interns by objecting to so many white interns in the group.

The interns hired a lawyer to represent a student who had been arrested and charged with resisting arrest.

The interns submitted the list of experienced teachers they wanted to work with to the Administrator, and they began to meet with that group.

A new group process consultant joined the group.

The Administrator did not accept the list of experienced teachers submitted by the interns and selected those teachers she felt would be suitable.

The Executive Director agreed to pay two experienced teachers at Hyde Park High School working with University of Chicago MAT's not in the cadre but interning at Hyde Park High School.

The first meeting of interns, experienced teachers, and the Administrator was held.

The interns and liaison met with the Executive Director and voiced displeasure with the paying of the experienced teachers not in the cadre.

At the next meeting of the cadre a Philosophy course was introduced by the Administrator as a cadre project. The social work intern verbally presented to them an outline of social work services to be offered. A weekend retreat was proposed.

Woodlawn Community Board meeting was held and the interns attended. All of the white interns left together prior to the end of the meeting.

The liaison met with the interns to speak of the implications of their actions in leaving the meeting early.

October, 1969

The FPHP staff went to Hyde Park High School to introduce the program to the faculty at a faculty meeting. The administrator of the school introduced the Executive Director by saying that FPHP was a way for Black people to enter the U of C.

A faculty meeting was held in a local bar to voice displeasure with the Administration of the school. The interns attended.

A system of convenorship of cadre meetings was set up.

Plans were made for the inclusion of students in the cadre.

Plans were made for a weekend retreat to make up for the lack of total involvement in the FPHP summer program, and to set the goals of the cadre along with the formulation of plans for school related projects.

The interns and liaison sent a letter to the director of R & E stating their displeasure with the report of the researcher who worked with them in the summer, and requested that it not be published.

... to discuss the role of the Administrator in the cadre.

A new R & E report came out describing the Hyde Park Cadre in the summer.

The cadre never considered it.

WESP Hyde Park Project director and a researcher attended a cadre meeting uninvited and unannounced and suggested that the cadre accept a WESP researcher.

A new meeting time and place were agreed upon as 3:15 p.m. each Monday at the U. of C.

A meeting was held with the interns and the cadre liaison to discuss the fact that the cadre was caught in the middle between the Hyde Park WESP staff and the Administrator.

Meeting was held to finalize plans for the weekend retreat. (See Appendix B)

The Executive Director met with the cadre to discuss the legal aspects of bringing students on the retreat.

Weekend retreat was attended by interns, five experienced teachers, the Administrator, the cadre liaison, two group process consultants, the Executive Director, and the author. Goals were set. (see Appendix C). The consensus model was adopted for decision making. Potential cadre projects were identified. (see Appendix D)

November, 1969

Students attended first cadre meeting.

Orientation for the students was held.

Cadres asked by consultant to list their concerns and to prioritize them.

(see Appendix E)

All interviews were held with the interns, experienced teachers, the Administrator, and the students in the cadre.

Community parent representative joined the group.

... side to Hyde Park WESP Project office to send a researcher to the cadre. (see Appendix F)

Plans were made to decide on cadre sponsored project for the school.

WESP weekend retreat held to begin plans for the implementation of projects which had been written up the previous year. No interns attended.

Proposal was made by an experienced teacher that the cadre begin addressing themselves to teacher competence, and that a project could come later. There was a split between those who were process oriented and those who were task oriented over the switch from teacher competence to projects.

At "all cadre meeting" the experienced teachers and the Administrator talked about static they received from other faculty members, and WESP over involvement in the cadre. At that time it was suggested that an FFTP researcher be requested, and one of the experienced teachers was sent to discuss the matter with the Executive Director.

Interns begin to work with WESP on projects.

FFTP Research assistant joined the group as a non-participant observer.

Thanksgiving vacation.

December, 1969

Social work intern was unable to get group going at Hyde Park High School, so she began to go to an elementary school in the area two afternoons a week to fulfill degree requirements.

A proposal was made for all cadre members to visit each other's classes and to discuss the observations. The discussion centered around whether this would be a total group project, whether this should be scheduled, and whether people should come back to the cadre and share their observations.

Many observations were on.

WESP weekend workshop was held at the U. of C. to begin implementing the plans which had been drawn up on the previous retreat. Interns attended, and two were on the steering committee.

Transcript of cadre meeting was done and given to cadre to be used as they saw fit.

"All cadre meeting" was held, and the cadre discussed priorities of teacher/pupil relations.

A presentation was made by the social work intern as to the social work program to be implemented at the school, and how the cadre could fit into it.

This was submitted in writing to the cadre. (see Appendix G)

The consultant suggested subgrouping as a means to discuss future observations of each other's classes.

Transcript of another cadre meeting was done and sent to the members, so that they could discuss it at the next meeting.

One of the experienced teachers left Hyde Park High School to do additional graduate work at the U. of C.

Christmas vacation.

January, 1970

The issue of trust was raised in connection with the lack of visitations.

The members had not read the transcript and were not prepared to discuss it and its implications on their teaching.

The cadre wrote a letter to the Executive Director stating that they wanted the experienced teacher who had left Hyde Park High School to remain a cadre member.

The Executive Director attended a cadre meeting to discuss with them the reasons the cadre wasn't evolving. She issued three questions to be answered by the end of the month. The questions which grew out of their statements were:

Did they want to remain a cadre?

What would be their operating mode? Did they want to retain the services of the liaison and consultant, or did they want new ones?

Proof of support of the social work intern and her program.

An intern went to see the Assistant Director about the students being paid from FTTP general fund and not from the Hyde Park Cadre fund.

An intern was punched in the mouth by a student in the halls at Hyde Park High School.

The "all cadre meeting" was held. Mr. Lortie from the University of Chicago spoke about "Teacher Collegiality: the Hypothesis of Chronic Ambivalence."

The cadre discussed the fact that after four and a half months there had not evolved any special relationship among them, which would differ from the relationships they had with the other faculty members on an individual basis.

Cadre meetings were held to discuss the issues raised by the Executive Director.

The Executive Director sent a letter to the cadre explaining the program's position.

The cadre decided that the liaison and consultant could stay as non-voting members, and that they could not voice their opinions and feelings on matters. Two experienced teachers and the WESP representative stated that they would help the social work intern.

Non-classroom teachers were defined as non-members of the cadre.

T. H. S. C.

Non-classroom teachers were defined as non-members of the cadre.

The social work intern and other intern withdrew from the cadre.

A meeting of interns, experienced teachers, and the Administrator was called.

The Parent was not told about the meeting restrictions, so she also attended.

FTPP staff was called in, and the decisions were communicated to them.

The Executive Director sent a memo to the cadre restating the decisions, and giving the programmatic response to them. (see Appendix H)

February, 1970

Subgroups met for two weeks along subject matter lines.

Executive Director attended meeting to discuss the operational mode of the cadre.

The liaison met with the interns, experienced teachers, Administrator, consultant, and WESP representative to communicate that she could not accept membership on non-voting terms. The cadre agreed to allow her to vote.

Topic of teacher leniency and flexibility was raised by the teachers in response to student statements to the effect that teachers at Hyde Park High School were too lenient.

Discussion was held regarding racial and cultural Biases of teachers. (see Appendix I)

Decision was made for teacher leniency and flexibility to be used for the video tape for the FTPP Spring Conference, and that the students would discuss it in a fishbowl arrangement.

Issue of white teachers in a Black school was discussed.

"All cadre meeting" was held to discuss Placement Year and Summer Proposals.

The cadre decided to have a Placement Year Proposal, since many of the

members would not be available for the summer. The Administrator suggested a proposal that she would like to see. Another suggestion was for two members of the cadre to look through the Project File of WESP to see if there were any programs which had not been implemented, into which the cadre would buy. Another decision was made to have two retreats to finalize plans for the Placement Year Proposal.

March, 1970

Video tape was done on the subjects of "Teacher Leniency and Flexibility," and the "Racial Issue."

A meeting of interns was held at one of their houses to discuss "rumors" that were going around the school to the effect that they would not be allowed to return for the Placement Year.

At the next cadre meeting it was suggested that the "rumors" be discussed in place of discussions of a Placement Year Proposal. Decision was made to ask for a meeting with the Executive Director of the Program, the Executive Director of WESP, and the Administrator.

Letters were sent to the three people asking that they attend the meeting.

Letters supporting the interns were submitted to WESP by two Hyde Park High School department chairmen.

The meeting was held with the Executive Directors of the Program and WESP, and the Administrator. The five interns, three of the experienced teachers, the liaison, the WESP representative, a WESP researcher, and a WESP staff person attended the meeting. Some of the rumors were dispelled. Since the cadre should have been presented to the Woodlawn Community Board prior to its entry into Hyde Park High School, a presentation would have to be made in the Spring to get acceptance of the Placement Year

commitment. It was suggested that the presentation of the program be made to the faculty of Hyde Park High School prior to the Woodlawn Community Board presentation, to assure them that their places would not be taken by the white interns.

FTPP sponsored pilot reading program began at Hyde Park High School.

Classes of two cadre members participated. (see Appendix J)

A proposal was made by Hyde Park faculty to Woodlawn Community Board for all of them to receive superior ratings until suitable evaluation criteria and procedures could be established.

One intern and an experienced teacher tried to see the Project file of Hyde Park WESP, without success.

Viewing of video tapes took place.

"All cadre meeting" was held where Dr. Hurst, President of Malcolm X Jr. College, talked about teachers and their roles in Black schools, and Mr. Brannon, from the Chicago Urban League, raised questions as to the goals and aims of the program.

Two interns and one experienced teacher submitted proposals for consideration by the cadre. Two were accepted and one was rejected.

One experienced teacher met with the liaison and the Executive Director to discuss her leaving the cadre. After the discussion she decided not to leave.

Budgets were submitted to the cadre for the proposals, and a decision was made to divide the cadre into subgroups to rewrite the whole proposal.

Meeting was held with the Executive Director of the program to discuss the third presentation of the program to the Hyde Park High School faculty.

The meeting was attended by three interns, two experienced teachers, and the WESP representative.

Experienced teachers were docked pay for lack of attendance.

April, 1970

Third presentation of the program to the total Hyde Park High School faculty done by the Executive Director.

One experienced teacher wrote a letter to the Executive Director withdrawing from the cadre.

Hyde Park Cadre Placement Year Proposal, "Alternatives after Graduation" was submitted in final form to FPHP and to Hyde Park Cadre for consideration. Section on Evaluation was questioned.

Experienced teachers complained about being docked since there were teachers in the school being paid but not required to be in the cadre.

A discussion was held as to whether the edited video tape could be shown at the Spring Conference.

The cadre viewed the edited version of the video tapes, and decided that it could be shown at the Conference.

An intern went to see the Executive Director about FPHP paying the students in the cadre from the FPHP general fund instead of from the Hyde Park Cadre fund of \$2,000.

FFPP Spring Conference was held.

Woodlawn Community Board directed the Administrator of Hyde Park High School to give the teachers superior ratings, until acceptable evaluation criteria could be set up.

The cadre discussed the conference and a suggestion was made by the consultant that the cadre listen to the tapes of sessions which involved members of the cadre. It was decided that this would be done on the weekend retreat.

Guesses were made as to why FIPP was dissatisfied with the Placement Year Proposal.

A meeting was held with the Executive Director of the program to discuss her critique of the proposal. The meeting was attended by two interns, three experienced teachers, the Administrator, and the consultant.

Spring vacation.

Woodlawn Community Board meeting was held. The Executive Director presented the program, and sought acceptance of the Board for the interns to fulfill their Placement Year obligations. The permission was granted, and a request was made for the cadre members to attend the next meeting and to be presented to the Board. The only cadre members present were one experienced teacher and the WESP representative.

May, 1970

The Executive Director attended the next cadre meeting to relate the decision of the Woodlawn Community Board to the cadre, and to tell them that they were to be presented at the next meeting of the Woodlawn Community Board.

Administrator sent in superior ratings to Board of Education. They were sent back for her signature.

The cadre discussed the critique of the proposal and the idea of the retreat. At that time it was stated that it would be held at the Leaning Tower YMCA in Niles, Illinois. The purpose of the retreat was to rewrite the proposal.

Cadre members decided during the week that some would not go to a retreat held outside of the city.

At the next meeting a questionnaire was presented by the consultant,

The focus was people wanted to rewrite the proposal, and whether

they would be back at Hyde Park High School the next year. (see Appendix K)

The unsigned teacher ratings were returned to the Administrator for her signature.

Woodlawn Community Board meeting was held. The Executive Director of the program introduced the cadre members. Four of the interns, four of the experienced teachers, the liaison, the Administrator, and the WESP representative attended. At the meeting, the Administrator stated that if the community did not back them, they would not return to the school. The meeting ended in a closed session.

Gang recruitment at the school was reported to be a problem.

Pilot reading project was completed.

Upon hearing the results of the questionnaire, the cadre decided that the retreat for the proposal, "Alternatives after Graduation", would be held at the University the following weekend.

On the first night of the retreat five interns, four of the experienced teachers, the parent representative, two of the students, the liaison, and the Executive Director attended. The group divided into two groups to talk about evaluation and the other parts of the proposal.

The second day of the retreat was attended by four interns, three experienced teachers, one student, and the liaison. The lack of man power was evident, and they decided that they would disband and not continue for the next year as a cadre, but would enter the school as individuals.

At the next meeting of the cadre the disbandment was rediscussed. It was decided that they would use the remaining weeks to prepare a statement on the reasons for the disbanding and to make requisitions for materials

for the next year from their cadre fund.

June, 1970

They decided to divide the remaining \$1,700 equally for projects suggested by the four interest groups in the cadre, (i.e. math teachers, English teachers, history teachers, and the students.) A subgroup began writing the rationale for disbanding.

Fire crackers were reported to be going off in the school.

The FPHP Demonstration Center was opened. One intern participated. Another intern and an experienced teacher attended.

Two of the interns took their class on a field trip to Cantigny War Memorial.

The faculty walked out of Hyde Park High School and did not teach for four days.

Invitations sent to FPHP and WESP staffs to cadre meetings. (see Appendix L)

The cadre divided up the money and wrote up the rationales for expenditures on curriculum projects. They also worked on the presentation of the reasons for their disbanding. (see Appendix M)

Woodlawn Community Board meeting was held, and the Hyde Park faculty walkout was discussed.

Open cadre meeting was held and the reasons for disbanding were articulated.

FFPP staff, and WESP staff people attended.

Requests for spending the cadre funds were turned in for the consideration of the Coordinating Committee.

The cadre decided not to disband, but rather for those who did not wish to continue, to resign.

The Coordinating Committee turned down the requests for funds.

Assistant Director sent a memorandum to cadre members about the decision of the Coordinating Committee and stated the prerequisites for FPHP to consider them a cadre. (see Appendix N)

Appendix B

Agenda For Hyde Park Retreat

TO: Hyde Park Cadre
FROM: Consultant
RE: Weekend Retreat

1. Dates: Friday, October 31, 1969 to Sunday, November 2, 1969
2. Place: Camp William Bruckner in New Buffalo, Michigan
Phone Number 359-0010
3. Departure Time and Place: 5:30 from Judd Hall (Corner 59th Kimbark)
4. Type of Transportation: Bus (National Transportation) for all participants

Weekend Focus:

1. Getting to know each other
2. Decision making
3. Defining goals of the cadre
4. Possible identification of a cadre sponsored "project."

Time Schedule:

Friday 7:00 PM Dinner
8:30 PM Opening session
11:00 PM Free time

Saturday 8:00 AM Breakfast
9:00 AM Morning session
12:00 PM Lunch
1:30 PM Afternoon session
4:30 PM Free time
5:30 PM Dinner
7:00 PM Evening Session
10:00 PM Free time

Sunday 8:00 AM Breakfast
9:00 AM Final session
12:00 PM Departure for home

Responsibility:

Equipment: Record Player --- experienced teacher
Newsprint, Masking tape, ditto
master, pencil and pads ----- liaison
Records ----- consultant

NOTE: Everyone must bring his own towel and wash cloth.

Appendix C

HYDE PARK CADRE GOALS - PRIORITIES

Operational Definitions

Have school where all students can and will stay all four years.
Help students set up and accomplish goals through high school and college - raise aspirations.

Rationale

Assist cadre members in attaining professional competence.
Provide emotional support for teachers (new and old).
Building lines of communication - develop trust.
Develop means of looking at selves, procedures, etc.
Understand political, social, cultural, and economic structure of the area.
Create a clearer understanding of role and goals of administration of H.P. Understanding of what is and can be.

Non-Cadre Members

Active involvement of students and parents and H.P. staff in activities of cadre.
Provide new, meaningful experiences for students in addition to regular classes.

Retention of Staff

Retain new teachers and interns at H.P.
Keep this cadre going as long as it is a valuable tool.

Evaluation

Develop means of looking at selves, procedures, etc.
Continual evaluation of programs and their relevance to students and community.

Guiding Principles

Recommend findings changes and guidelines to proper authorities: agencies and Board of Education.
Communication with other projects that can contribute, that the cadre can tie into outside the school.

Appendix D

HYDE PARK CADRE PROJECTS

November, 1969

1. Bridge Program - 20 students per teacher. Supportive role through High School and College. Utilize people in the community for same.
2. Utilization of resources relevant to Black students in reading, math, literature, music.
3. Tutoring and extra money for tutoring.
4. Establish contacts with colleges (17)
5. Develop cross-disciplinary projects (7)
6. Establish contact with industries, unions, work-study programs (19)
7. Develop new courses relevant to student interests. (20)
8. Provide means to facilitate change from Wadsworth to H. P. (21)
9. Implement administrative communication - lines of communication opened up between administration and all components. (23)

... ..

1.

Appendix E

HYDE PARK CADRE CONCERNS

1. Interpersonal relations between teachers and students to produce maximum "output" by students and teachers.
2. Roles of the white teacher in a Black school - how it affects performance.
3. How the cadre relates to the community.
4. How the curriculum relates to the community.
5. Sharing of inter-cadre subject matter experiences.

Prepared for the December all-cadre meeting.

Re-read to the cadre by Executive Director at the Jan. 12 meeting.

Appendix F

Request for WESP Researcher

November 24, 1969

Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project
Hyde Park High School
6220 South Stony Island Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Gentlemen:

We, as members of the Hyde Park cadre of the Ford Training and Placement Program, request a Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project researcher to participate in our cadre. This is per the request by you and your researcher on October 27th at our cadre meeting.

The cadre meets in the East Lounge, second floor, Ida Noyes Hall, 1219 East 59th Street every Monday from 3:15 - 5:15 and once a month on Saturday morning in the University High School, 5840 South Kenwood Avenue.

In order to expedite participation of the WESP researcher in our cadre, some cadre members will call for an appointment with you in the near future.

Sincerely,

Cadre Liaison
Ford Training and Placement Program

Appendix G

SOCIAL WORK SERVICES AT HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Description of the Service

This service consists of identifying and working with Freshmen and/or Sophomore girls and boys who are attending classes fairly regularly but who are not performing as well as they can or are very withdrawn, or who are causing trouble in the classroom by their acting out behavior or behavior which interferes with their learning. Through their participation in a small group, the girls and boys may be helped to gain control over their behavior and to understand and manage their own feelings. It has been demonstrated that the improvement in a person's social adjustment increases the possibility of their succeeding in school.

This service also involves working with individuals in crisis situations where the school counselors may not have the time to intervene. Some of the situations might be finding a home or placement for pregnant girls, finding employment, making a referral for long term treatment, and working with both boys and girls who are consistently truant but who appear to have the potential to succeed in school.

Procedures

A. Referrals for group services

1. In order to work as a team, RPP intern will accept referrals for a group of from 8 - 10 girls from the Freshman and Sophomore Division Teachers in the Hyde Park Cadre. Intern will accept referrals of boys from the Counselors. Because of the time factor both social work interns will be limited to work with one group.

2. A conference will be held with the division teacher to discuss the present classroom problem.
 3. A conference will be held when possible with the counselor to discuss (a) previous school adjustment, (b) home situation and family relationships, (c) nature of previous parent-school relationships and (d) nature of earlier efforts to help.
 4. In consultation with the field instructor the social worker will select those persons who appear most likely to benefit from a group experience.
 5. An interview will be held with each student to explain the service and to determine if he is interested in being in a group.
 6. A contact will be made with the parent to discuss the problem and to secure permission for the student to participate in a group. It is understood that it is the right of the parent and/or student to refuse the service.
 7. The social workers will observe the students in the classroom.
 8. Conferences with the division teacher will be arranged on a regularly scheduled basis. This may take the form of a problem clinic which will deal with the problems in the classroom and the pressures from family, peer group, community, etc.
- B. Referrals for individual service
1. Referrals will be accepted from counselors and teachers. Teachers should check through counselors to avoid duplication of services.
 2. Contact will be made with the family.
 3. Follow-up conferences will be held with counselors and/or teachers on the disposition of the referral.

Social Worker's Responsibilities

1. Work directly with a group.
2. Work with individuals in crisis or emergency situations.
3. Make referrals to appropriate school and community programs when necessary.
4. Make family contacts.
5. Collaborate and consult with school personnel.
6. Observe the students in the classroom setting.
7. Make records of group and individual progress.
8. Attend appropriate school and community activities as necessary and time permits.
9. Participate in weekly meeting of Hyde Park Cadre. (Applies only to FPHP intern.)
10. Provide consultation to teachers on individuals and group process when requested.
11. Participate in weekly conferences with the Field Instructor.

Appendix H

MEMORANDUM

January 28, 1970

TO: Hyde Park Cadre
FROM: Executive Director
Ford Training and Placement Program

This memo is a staff and programmatic response to the decisions communicated to me by the Hyde Park cadre on Monday, January 26th, 1970.

1. We understand you wish to continue your participation in the Ford Training and Placement Program. While we have no objection to your sub-group plan, we must insist that continued cadre functioning demands some formal mechanism for exchange of information between the three groups.

First, without a weekly reconvening of the group and a sub-group reporting session, there is little possibility that a summer project involving most cadre members could be planned, nor could the group's attention focus on activities for the placement year.

Second, Your (previous and) proposed operational mode all but eliminates the cross-role concept (see Getzels' article) of the cadre. We can hope for cross-disciplinary sharing only if at least one-third to one-half of each meeting is devoted to this sharing of information.

Third, In purely practical terms, the total cadre must confirm requests for funds from the \$2,000 budget. Further, you must remember that these requests must be approved by the liaison person. If you will review your bulletin discussion allocation of funds, this money is to be used to support total cadre projects.

Fourth, While we feel the curriculum groups could be functional, without the sharing mechanism involving the total group, the programmatic commitments of the FIPP are not being met by the Hyde Park cadre. (We hope that your sub-group plan will be a functional one and not merely a way of avoiding dealing with other issues. The staff is considering ways of facilitating the cross-role concepts of mutual support, trust and understanding. The cadre must address itself to this issue also).

2. The social work intern has conferred with me and is considering the possibility of continuing to meet with the Hyde Park cadre. She will continue her internship activities at Hyde Park for the remainder of this academic year.

3. The intern has discussed his feelings with me and is also considering the possibility of continued cadre participation during this quarter.

4. The consultant has indicated that he can operate as a consultant with the cadre, not as a voting member, but with the understanding that he will express comments as he feels necessary.

5. The liaison has not decided whether she wishes to work as a liaison without voting membership in the cadre. She would like to meet with you to discuss this relationship on Monday, February 2nd.

6. The researcher will continue to function as a non-participant observer and assist the cadre with internal evaluation as the need arises.

I should like to meet with your group again on Monday, February 2nd, to clarify any of the items in this memo. If you have questions, please feel free to call and speak with me individually. It is our sincere hope, the hope of the total staff that the proposed reorganization and our requirement for the total group exchange are compatible and will permit the Hyde Park cadre to benefit the students and school community of Hyde Park High School.

Appendix I

Synopsis of a Cadre Meeting

February 18, 1970

FORD TRAINING AND PLACEMENT PROGRAM HYDE PARK CADRE MEETING

The following issues were raised in this sequence during the meeting.
The topic of the meeting was:

"Racial and Cultural Biases of Teachers"

1. Video tape
2. Should we subgroup?
3. Let's not talk about leniency.
4. Cultural and racial biases of teachers.
5. Upward Bound report on teacher failures.
6. Should we subgroup?
7. Leniency should be discussed.
8. Cultural and racial biases of teachers.
9. Clarification of Upward Bound paper
10. Objections raised to Upward Bound resource
 - a. How was research done and by whom?
 - b. What were criteria used?
 - c. Emphasis put on teachers and not system.
 - d. Report is prejudiced since they are dealing with a subject they don't understand.
 - e. Focus of Upward Bound on college bound students and there are more types of students in "inner-city" schools
11. Why are we spending this time on Upward Bound and not the original question (4 & 8?)
12. Upward Bound is prejudiced.
13. They are devoted to the students they work with
14. Let's get to Hyde Park. Student failures - is it because of the teachers or not?
15. Role of white teacher in Black school
16. Are there certain things a teacher needs in his background in order to teach in an "inner-city" school (e.g. Teacher who grew up in rural setting).
17. Are there white teachers who have problems in a Black school. If so, why?
18. Unsureness of whether they will be accepted, but that wears off. How? Why?
19. In Black situation Black person has the Black experience and rapport with students. Black children under assimilation in schools, while white children undergo socialization.
20. That also goes along class lines - economic factor

21. It's the total environment, and not just class
22. Black children undergo forced adaptability to environment when entering school
23. Does that mean Black teacher understands students better?
24. Problem with Black middle-class teachers
25. There is no such thing as Black middle-class. People who think so are fooling themselves
26. Upward Bound study didn't refer to race but class
27. That's not Black problem - Upward Bound full of missionaries
28. White teachers who succeed in Black schools by becoming involved in Black environment
29. Problem of Latin American schools raised. Upward Bound and the like are killing the kids and their culture
30. Problem of ethnicity - Black kids won't put up with missionaries. This is what is happening in classrooms now.
31. Concept of "school elite" and "community elite" students raised.
32. What do the students think of this?
33. Students want to learn about Black culture now
34. Role of history in understanding the present raised with examples
35. Students interested in present
36. Methodology in teaching about past
37. How do we make the school more relevant to the "community elite"?
 - a. Who are they?
 - b. Are they making it?
 - c. Where?
 - d. How?
38. We want to broaden the horizons of the students so we try to teach things you aren't familiar with
39. Tension between innovative techniques and standard curriculum
40. Students more action oriented and want answers to questions teachers don't have
41. Conflict between students' desires for immediate action and courses which are future oriented
42. Students want to know about things with which teachers are unfamiliar.
43. Is there a greater role both teachers and students can play in the community?
44. Students raise problems within the community. They would like teacher involvement but feel teachers are only interested in class
45. Teachers have lives separate from school, where they may be involved with community, but students don't see them
46. Community problems and their solutions should be part of the curriculum, along with action
47. Social studies and English more conducive to this.
48. Problems of field trips discussed. Suggestions of after class and weekend trips made
49. Teacher has to decide if he can deal with the problems of the community (e.g. Black teacher in white school)
50. Articles in Sun-Times on innovative curricula and school systems in large cities.

51. Suggestion to have resources (people involved in community action) come to the cadre. Use Ford money for innovations

Topic for next meeting, Wednesday, February 25, 1970: "What makes good teaching at Hyde Park High School?"

Appendix J

PROPOSAL FOR HYDE PARK HIGH SCHOOL

A READING MORATORIUM

- Premise:** Reading levels of drop-outs, Army recruits and other dis-advantaged individuals are being raised in short term intensive programs. Why not high school students?
- Purpose:** Raise the Reading levels of a large group of students at Hyde Park High School.
- Approach:** Promotional and positive. Use the same method industry uses to sell a new product. Create a market. Begin early in Sept. Send releases to news media. Involve radio, T. V. newspapers. Get some radio or T. V. personalities involved. Sell the community, teachers and students on the program. Make it a program of pride in what Black students can achieve when given the opportunity.
- Attitudinal Aims :** Effect a change in High School teachers apprehensions about teaching Reading. Run a control program taught by Hyde Park teachers to show the programs that can be made.

Show students that a Reading program need not be remedial. It can be for general up grading. Provide incentives (non-academic). Prizes for greatest gain. We hope that in working for non-academic goals, while achieving scholastic success, some attitudinal changes will occur.

PLAN

Part I Control Groups

- What: Run an 8 week intensive Reading program in 2 to 4 regular English classes.
- When: March 16, 1970 to May 15, 1970.
- Who: The regular teachers of these classes will implement the program. They will be prepared for this by in-service training in use of tests, materials and motivational methods.
- How:
1. Standardized tests will be administered.
 2. A variety of materials will be introduced in class.
The levels will be commensurate with the Reading levels of the students.
 3. Each student will work at his own level and progress at his own speed.
 4. An incentive will be offered. (non-academic)
Severe remediation problems have chance of greatest gain.

Appendix L

Invitation to Cadre Disbanding Session

We request your attendance at a meeting on June 15, 1970, at 3:30 p.m. in Ida Noyes Hall, second floor East Lounge, 1212 East 59th Street. The purpose of this meeting will be to explain why we have decided not to plan to implement a cadre proposal in the placement year and to explain our decision for disbandment, effective June 27, 1970. A written communication stating some of the reasons for the above decisions will be sent to you prior to the June 15 meeting.

May 1970
Newsletter

Appendix N

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

date: July 9, 1970

To: Hyde Park Cadre Members
From: Assistant Director
Re: Hyde Park Cadre Request for Funds

At its June 26th meeting, the Coordinating Committee of the Ford Training and Placement Program recommended that the Hyde Park cadre request for funds for educational materials (submitted June 19, 1970) not be funded. The purpose of this memo is to delineate the reasons for that decision.

The cadre model which is central to the Ford Training and Placement Program envisions a group of professionals whose unique resources are brought together for mutual support and for the development of crossrole thrusts which will improve education in the cadre school. Of the five individuals interested in continuing as a cadre, four are interns and one is a student. This group would not represent integration of experienced teachers or of administration. It implies, rather, the isolation of a particular group and is a direct contradiction to the basic notion of the cadre as a group which overcomes professional isolation. There is no evidence in the history of this group that they will be able to move beyond isolation. The cadre's history has been, in fact, evidence of failure to achieve a unified group.

The cadre requests give further evidence that the cadre is unable to function as a group. The proposals are divided by subject areas and reinforce the traditional organization of the school. While the Ford Training and Placement Program encourages the development of in-role competence and expertise, while it has supported and will continue to support subject matter projects, it does so with the view of extending the influence of a cooperative model. Based as it is on a disbanded cadre, support of these proposals - while valid in itself - would not encourage or increase the effectiveness of the crossrole notion. The Kenwood cadre was in a similar situation in the summer of 1969, and submitted similar requests. They were approved, but although they had value in specific ways, they did not help to encourage, unite, or develop the cadre notion.

Consequently, from the history of the Hyde Park cadre and the history of the program, we are led to conclude that the funding of the Hyde Park Cadre proposal would not be effective in rejuvenating the cadre notion. Without that cadre notion, Ford Training and Placement Program becomes merely a source of funds for program

improvement and as such might come into conflict with the Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project, through which such proposals should be approved and supported. We have no desire to infringe on the role and authority of W.E.S.P. We had hoped that the cadre notion would be a worthy addition and complement to W.E.S.P. Without the cadre notion we can be seen as an interference and we refuse to assume that position.

We do not wish to discourage the cadre notion; nor do we wish to withdraw support from those teachers who will be at Hyde Park during the 1970-71 school year, partially in fulfillment of their placement year commitment to the Ford Training and Placement Program. We have rejected the proposals because we feel they would be dysfunctional to the cadre notion. We will continue to support the teachers who have been Ford Training and Placement Program interns in the following ways:

1. We will be of any assistance we can in helping teachers with the W.E.S.P. interview process.
2. The human resources of the Ford Training and Placement Program will continue to be available to assist with placement and teaching problems. We will also assist in attaining other University resources in any way we can.
3. We will continue to encourage you to develop a cadre and will offer you the human resources you desire for that purpose. However, we will not take responsibility for that purpose. We have tried, and we have failed. Perhaps you can do better. We encourage you to try and we will offer what help we can.
4. If you reach a point where you feel you have a cadre, we will reconsider financial support. For that to happen, we would need the evidence of integration of Blacks and whites, integration of experienced and beginning teachers, administrative cooperation and support, and a proposal that shows a cross-role direction with use of human resources (not just the purchase of equipment).

The rejection of a request is obviously negative, but we hope that this memo shows that our negative decision is rational. We hope that it is a decision which is in the best interests of all the major parties concerned - cadre members, academic departments, W.E.S.P., Ford Training and Placement Program, and the students at Hyde Park. While negative decisions will always have discouraging and depressing immediate results, we hope that in the long run our response will encourage growth. That is the spirit in which the decision was made; we hope it can be accepted by others in that spirit.